

In The United States Patent And Trademark Office

Applicant:	Heikki Vatanen et al.	Date:	March 9, 2010
Date Filed:	September 20, 2006	Docket No.:	LEITZI-2
App. No.:	10/598,181	Art Unit:	1792
For:	Method for Coating a Paper/Board Web	Examiner:	N. Empie

Filed by Electronic Filing System

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office action dated Feb. 16, 2010, please consider the following Remarks. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required with respect to this communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-2663.

Remarks

Claims 11, and 13-23 remain pending in the application. In the Office action dated February 14, 2010 claims 19, 21, and 22 were rejected as obvious over *Nakamura* in view of *Arai*, *Chino*, and *Kondo*. Claim 20 was rejected as obvious over *Nakamura* in view of *Arai*, *Chino*, and *Kondo* and further in view of Kustermann. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nakamura* in view of *Arai*, *Chino*, and *Kondo* and further in view of Yapel. Claims 11, 14, 15, 17 and 18 were rejected as obvious over *Nakamura et al* in view of *Arai*, *Chino*, *Okada*, and *Kondo*.

The courtesy extended to applicant's counsel by Examiner Nathan Empie and Supervisory Examiner Michael Cleveland in the telephone interview conducted Mar. 8, 2010, is acknowledged with appreciation. During the interview *Nakamura et al.*, *Arai*, Japanese publication JP 07.2045661 and *Okada* were discussed. During the interview applicant argued that the examiner's *prima facie* obviousness case was deficient because although *Nakamura et al.* discloses a device capable of cross machine profile measurements of a plurality of